Benilda Group Flores Mocari S.A. Tinzuque Group Agricola Benilda Flores Monserrate Ltda. Tinzuque Ltda. Catu S.A. Agricola La Celestina Flores Sagaro Agricola La Maria Flores San Juan Toto Flowers Caicedo Group Flores Silvestres **Tuchany Group** Flores Munya Andalucia Flores Tomine Flores Sibate Aranjuez S.A. Flores Tropicales Group Flores Tikiya Exportaciones Bochica S.A. Flores Tropicales Ltda. Happy Candy Mercedes Ltda. Floral Ltda. Tuchany S.A. Uniflor Ltda. Flores del Cauca S.A. Velez De Monchaux e Hijos y Cia Cantarrana Group Rosas Colombianas Ltda. Victoria Flowers Agricola los Venados Florex Group Vuelven Ltda. Cantarrana Ltda. Agricola Guacari Deer Field Flowers Flores Altamira We have received requests for Claveles Colombianos Group Flores de Exportacion revocation from the antidumping duty Claveles Colombianos Ltda. Santa Helena S.A. order for the following exporters/ Fantasia Flowers Ltda. Floricola la Gaitana S.A. growers: Funza Group Splendid Flowers Ltda. Agricola Circasia Sun Flowers Ltda. Flores Alborada Agrodex Group Claveles de los Alpes Ltda. Flores de Funza Cultivos Miramonte Colibri Flowers Flores del Bosque Flores Aurora Cultiflores **Guacatay Group** Flores de Serrezuela Cultivos Miramonte Agricola Guacatay Flores el Zorro Cultivos Tahami Ltda. Jardines Bacata Flores Mocari Daflor Agricola Cunday Funza Group **Envy Farms Group** Hosa Ltda. Flores Funza Envy Farms Ltda. Industrial Agricola Flores del Bosque Flores Marandua Ltda. Ingro Ltda. Flores Alborada Falcon Farms de Colombia S.A. Inverpalmas Hosa Ltda. (formerly Flores de Cajibio Ltda.) Inversiones Morrosquillo Inverpalmas Floraterra Group Inversiones Supala S.A. Maxima Farms Group Flores San Mateo S.A. Jardines de Chia Ltda. Agricola Los Arboles Polo Flowers Siete Flores S.A. Jardines Fredonia Flores Casablanca S.A. Las Amalias/Pompones Rainbow Flowers Santana Flowers Group Floreales Group Manjui Ltda. Floreales Ltda. Maxima Farms Group Santana Flowers, Ltda. Hacienda Curubital Ltda. Kimbaya Agricola Los Arboles Inversiones Istra Ltda. Flores Aurora **Polo Flowers** Flores Calima S.A. Rainbow Flowers Tinzuque Group Tinzuque Ltda. Flores Canelon M.G. Consultores Ltda. Catu S.A. Monteverde Ltda. Flores Colon Uniflor Flores de Aposentos Natuflora Flores de Bojaca Papagayo Group Flores de Colombia Înversiones Calypso S.A. Flores de la Sabana S.A. Agricola Papagayo Flores de la Vega Ltda. (Vegaflor) Queens Flowers de Colombia Flores de la Vereda S.A. (Flover) Rosas Sabanilla Group regulations. Flores del Hato Agricola la Capilla Flores del Rio Group Flores la Colmena Agricola Cardenal Inversiones la Serena Flores del Rio Rosas Sabanilla Indigo S.A. San Martin Bloque B Ltda. Dated: April 28, 1995. Flores del Salitre Ltda. Santa Helena S.A. Joseph A. Spetrini, Flores de Oriente Santana Flowers Group Flores de Serrezuela Santana Flowers Ltda. Flores de Suba Ltda. Hacienda Curubital Ltda. BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P Flores el Cipres Inversiones Istra Ltda. Flores el Lobo Santa Rosa Group Flores el Molino S.A. Agropecuaria Ŝierra Loma Flores el Tandil Flores Santa Rosa **Technology** Floricola la Ramada Flores el Zorro Flores Jayvana Senda Brava Ltda. Flores Juanambu Soagro Group RIN 0693-ZA05 Flores la Fragrancia Agricola el Mortino Flores la Mana Flores Aguaclara Ltda. Flores la Union Flores del Monte Ltda.

Flores la Estancia

Tecnica Agricola Ganadera (TAG)

Jaramillo y Daza

Flores la Valvanera Ltda.

Group)

Flores Marvilla (of the Flores Tiba

Interested parties must submit applications for administrative protective orders in accordance with 19 CFR 353.34(b) of the Department's This initiation and notice are in accordance with section 751(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1675(a) and 19 CFR 353.22(c). Deputy Assistant Secretary for Compliance. [FR Doc. 95-11159 Filed 5-4-95; 8:45 am] National Institute of Standards and [Docket No. 950317076-5076-01] Manufacturing Extension Partnership **Program AGENCY: National Institute of Standards** and Technology (NIST), Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of availability of funds.

SUMMARY: The National Institute of Standards and Technology invites proposals from qualified organizations for funding projects to conduct the planning and coordination of manufacturing extension efforts at the state and local level under the Manufacturing Extension Partnership (MEP). These projects correspond to the State Technology Extension Program (STEP) component of MEP.

Program Planning project proposals can be submitted by all states or not-forprofit organizations designated by the state as responsible for manufacturing extension programs. States which have not received a planning award within the past two years from the National Institute of Standards and Technology under the State Technology Extension Program of the Manufacturing Extension Partnership are eligible. States that have received previous planning grants more than two years ago remain eligible for additional Program Planning projects. State which are performing planning on a regional basis within the state and which have recently received a regional planning award may apply for additional awards for planning in other regions. For further information, see Eligibility Criteria section.

DATES: Proposals from qualified organizations will be accepted from May 5, 1995, with a total of \$3,000,000 of funding available.

ADDRESSES: Applicants should submit proposals to the Manufacturing Extension Partnership, Bldg. 301, Room C121, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, MD 20899–0001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

For information regarding this announcement, contact the Manufacturing Extension Partnership at (301) 975–5020, or at: Manufacturing Extension Partnership, Bldg. 301, Room C121, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, Maryland 20899–0001.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance

The catalog number for the award of State Technology Extension Program funds in the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance is 11.613.

Background

In accordance with the provisions of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. § 272 (b)(1) and (c)(7) and § 278l), as amended, NIST will provide assistance to help states develop manufacturing assistance programs aimed at small- and mediumsized manufacturers and help bring those state programs to a level of performance where they can provide the full range of manufacturing extension services required by their manufacturers.

Under the NIST Manufacturing Extension Partnership (MEP), a cooperative effort to link and strengthen the nation's manufacturing extension programs and activities, NIST will make merit-based awards to states to help improve their planning, coordination, and implementation of their technology extension activities.

Funding Availability

Approximately \$3,000,000 will be available to support cooperative agreements under this program. This is sufficient to fund all states which have not received a STEP planning award within the past two years. Proposals must request less than \$100,000 in Federal funds.

Invitation for Proposals

Proposals will be accepted from qualified organizations from May 5, 1995, with a total of \$3,000,000 of funding available.

Award Period

The cooperative agreements entered into under this program will have a performance period of one year. If an application is selected for funding, NIST has no obligation to provide any additional future funding in connection with that award. Renewal of an award to increase funding or extend the period of performance is at the total discretion of NIST.

Cost Share Requirements

A cost sharing contribution from each applicant is required. NIST may provide financial support up to 50% of the total budget for the project, however, the federal share must be less than \$100,000. The applicant's share of the budget may include cash contributions from state, county, industrial or other non-federal sources and in-kind contributions which are directly related to the task to be accomplished.

Proposal Content

The proposal must, at a minimum, include the following:

A. An executive summary of the proposed project, consistent with the Evaluation Criteria stated in this notice.

B. A description of the proposed project, sufficient to permit evaluation of the proposal, in accordance with the proposal Evaluation Criteria stated in this notice.

C. A budget for the proposed project which identifies all sources of funds, and details expenses.

D. A description of the qualifications of key personnel who will be assigned to work on the proposed project.

E. A statement of work that discusses the specific tasks to be carried out, including a schedule of measurable events and milestones.

F. A letter from the Governor's office (not considered part of the page count) indicating that the applicant is the lead organization for conducting the proposed activities and acknowledging that there is only one proposal from that proposed activities and acknowledging that there is only one proposal from that state or region for Program Planning.

G. A Standard Form 424, 424–A, and 424–B (Rev 4–92) prescribed by OMB circular A–102, and Form CD–511, Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension and Other Responsibility Matters; Drug-Free Workplace Requirements and Lobbying. The 424 series of forms and form CD–511 will not be considered part of the page count of the proposal.

Proposal Format

The proposal must not exceed 20 typewritten pages in length. The proposal must contain both technical and cost information. The proposal page count shall include every page, including pages that contain words, table of contents, executive summary, management information and qualifications, resumes, figures, tables, and pictures. All proposals shall be printed such that pages are single-sided, with no more than fifty-five (55) lines per page. Use 21.6×27.9 cm (8½"×11") paper or A4 metric paper. Use an easyto-read font of not more than about 5 characters per cm (fixed pitch font of 12 or fewer characters per inch or proportional font of point size 10 or larger). Smaller type may be used in figures and tables, but must be clearly legible. Margins on all sides (top, bottom, left and right) must be at least 2.5 cm. (1"). The applicant may submit a separately bound document of appendices, containing letters of support for the proposal. The proposal should be self-contained and not rely on the appendices for meeting criteria. Excess pages in the proposal will not be considered in the evaluation. Applicants must submit one signed original plus six copies of the proposal.

Program Planning Projects

a. Project Objective

The purpose of Program Planning projects will be to create plans for state-

wide, coordinated, manufacturing extension programs in order to enhance the competitiveness of small- and medium-sized manufacturers by increasing their rate of adoption of improved technologies and techniques. These projects will plan for the development and coordination of existing and/or newly formed services, such as state industrial assistance programs; university-based industrial assistance programs; and business systems assistance programs, into a unified state-wide program. Plans will include methods for providing access to a wide range of technical services and access to related services for small- and medium-sized manufacturers in the state or region.

Applicants may conduct planning activities on an intrastate regional basis when regions are defined by the state. Regions should be clearly defined by the proposing organizations and it must be clear why the program is regionally oriented, versus state-wide.

Applicants may include small pilot testing activities as part of their planning process. If pilot testing of the proposed extension plan is included in the project, it should include methods of evaluating the pilot test's success in implementing the proposed extension plan. Any pilot activity must be consistent with the program plan developed for the state.

b. Program Planning Projects Evaluation Criteria

Proposals will be evaluated and rated on the basis of the following criteria by an impartial review panel. Each proposal should address all five evaluation criteria. Evaluation criteria are individually weighted. Selection will be based upon the total evaluation score of eligible proposals.

1. Market Research and Assessment (20 points): Potential applicants should specify a methodology for defining the demographics of the smaller manufacturers in the region (the customers for the extension system) and their technical assistance-related needs. Factors that will be considered include:

(a) Methodology for defining the size and demographic characteristics of the customer base to be served by the extension system.

- (b) Methodology for determining the customer base's technical assistance needs.
- (c) Methodology to ensure that the plan is appropriate for addressing identified industry needs.
- 2. Resource Identification and Assessment (20 points): Applicants should describe the methodology for collecting information about the

- number, size, technical sophistication, type, and relevance of existing industrial assistance activities that will be part of the coordination effort. Factors that will be considered include:
- (a) Methodology for identifying relevant assistance programs and other sources of expertise outside applicant's organization.
- (b) Methodology for assessing relevance and effectiveness of resources in addressing identifying industry needs.
- 3. Coordination with Existing Resources (20 points): Applicants should set forth a plan for interacting or coordinating with appropriate existing and/or newly-formed state and local industrial assistance services, potential industry partners, and appropriate federal services, to develop a coordinated state-wide delivery system. Factors that will be considered include:
- (a) Methodology and adequacy of plans for forming effective linkages and partnerships necessary to plan for and provide a coordinated range of services to meet the needs of the customer base.
- (b) Safeguards to ensure that planned activity does not duplicate existing services or resources.
- 4. Management (25 points): Applicants should specify plans for proper organization, staffing, and management of the planning process. Factors that will be considered include:
- (a) Appropriateness and authority of the governing or managing organization to conduct a state-wide (or regional) planning process.
- (b) Qualifications and demonstrated leadership of the project manager and any project team to conduct a state-wide (or regional) planning process.
- (c) Appropriateness of the organizational approach for carrying out the planning activity.
- (d) Evidence of significant involvement and support by the state.
- (e) Degree of leadership and control of the planning process by representatives from the private sector and especially smaller manufacturers.
- 5. Financial Plan (15 points):
 Applicants should show the relevance and cost effectiveness of the financial plan for meeting the objectives of the project; the firmness and level of the applicant's total financial support for the project; and the plan to implement the program after the cooperative agreement has expired. Factors that will be considered include:
 - (a) Cost effectiveness of the budget.
- (b) The strength of commitment of the proposer's cost share, and the percentage of cost share that is cash. Cash cost share is considered to

- demonstrate a stronger commitment than in-kind.
- (c) Effectiveness of management plans for control of budget.
- (d) The portion of cost sharing that is in-kind must be appropriate and directly related to performing the tasks described in the statement of work.

c. Eligibility Criteria

- Eligible applicants for these projects are state governments or non-profit organizations.
- All states or regions which have *not* received a planning award within the past two years from the National Institute of Standards and Technology under the State Technology Extension Program of the Manufacturing Extension Partnership are eligible.
- States that have received previous planning grants more than two years ago remain eligible for additional Program Planning projects.
- States which are performing planning on a regional basis within the state and which have recently received a regional planning award may apply for additional awards for planning in other regions.
- Applicants will be able to propose conducting the planning activities themselves or arranging for some or all of the planning activities to be carried out by a second party.
- One proposal for Program Planning will be accepted per state or region within a state.

d. Required Letters

A letter will be required from the Governor of the proposing state indicating that the eligible applicant is the lead organization in that state or region for the proposed Program Planning activities, and acknowledging that there is only one proposal from that state or region for a Program Planning project. Where more than one such otherwise qualified Program Planning proposal per state is submitted, all such proposals from that state may be disqualified.

e. Cost Share Requirements

A cost sharing contribution from each applicant is required. NIST may provide financial support up to 50% of the total budget for the project, however, the federal share must be less than \$100,000. The applicant's share of the budget may include cash contributions from state, county, industrial or other non-federal sources and in-kind contributions which are directly related to the task to be accomplished.

Proposal Selection Process

Proposal evaluation and selection process will be performed from the date

of publication of this document until further notice and will consist of three principal phases: proposal qualification, proposal review and award determination.

a. Proposal Qualification

All proposals will be reviewed by NIST to assure compliance with the proposal content and other basic provisions of this notice. Proposals which satisfy these requirements will be designated as qualified proposals. Non-qualified proposals will be returned to the proposer and may be resubmitted after addressing the omissions.

b. Proposal Review

NIST will appoint an evaluation panel, composed of at least three (3) reviewers, to review and evaluate all qualified proposals in accordance with the evaluation criteria and values set forth in this notice. After scoring, the panel will determine which proposals will be accepted and recommended for funding. For those proposals not recommended for funding at this stage, a NIST staff person not involved in the review of the proposal will contact the proposer and provide comments and feedback based upon the evaluation panel review. Proposals may then be modified and resubmitted for review.

c. Award Determination

The Director of NIST, or a designee, shall make final determination of whether an award should be made to the proposing organization based on the review of the panel's recommendations.

Additional Requirements

- (a) Federal policies and procedures. Recipients and sub-recipients are subject to all Federal laws and Federal and NIST policies, regulations, and procedures applicable to Federal financial assistance awards.
- (b) Indirect Costs. The total dollar amount of the indirect costs proposed in an application under this program must not exceed the indirect cost rate negotiated and approved by a cognizant Federal agency prior to the proposed effective date of the award or 100 percent of the total proposed direct costs dollar amount in the application, whichever is less.
- (c) Pre-award activities. If applicants incure any costs prior to an award being made, they do so solely at their own risk of not being reimbursed by the Government. Notwithstanding any written or verbal assurance that may have been received, there is no obligation on the part of NIST to cover pre-award costs.

(d) Delinquent federal debts. No award of Federal funds shall be made to an applicant who has an outstanding delinquent Federal debt until either:

(1) The delinquent account is paid in full:

- (2) A negotiated repayment schedule is established and at least one payment is received; or
- (3) Other arrangements satisfactory to NIST are made.

(e) Past Performance. Unsatisfactory performance under prior Federal awards may result in an application not being considered for funding.

(f) Name check review. All non-profit applicants are subject to a name check review process. Name checks are intended to reveal if any key individuals associated with the applicant have been convicted of or are presently facing criminal charges such as fraud, theft, perjury, or other matters which significantly reflect on the applicant's management honesty or financial integrity.

(g) Primary applicant certification. All primary applicants must submit a completed Form CD–511, "Certifications Regarding Debarment, Suspension and Other Responsibility

Matters; Drug-Free Workplace Requirements and Lobbying," and the following explanations are hereby provided.

(1) Non procurement debarment and suspension. Prospective participants (as defined at 15 CFR Part 26, Section 105) are subject to 15 CFR Part 26, "Non procurement Debarment and Suspension" and the related section of the certification form prescribed above applies:

(2) Drug-free workplace. Recipients (as defined at 15 CFR Part 26, Section 605) are subject to 15 CFR Part 26, Supart F, "Government-wide Requirements for Drug-Free Workplace (Grants)" and related section of the certification form prescribed above applies;

(3) Anti-lobbying. Persons (as defined at 15 CFR Part 28, Section 105) are subject to the lobbying provisions of 31 U.S.C. 1352, "Limitation on use of appropriated funds to influence certain Federal contracting and financial transactions," and the lobbying section of the certification form prescribed above applies to applications/bids for grants, cooperative agreements, and contracts for more than \$100,000, and loans and loan guarantees for more than \$150,000, or the single family maximum mortgage limit for affected programs, whichever is greater; and

(4) Anti-lobbying disclosures. Any applicant that has paid or will pay for lobbying using any funds must submit

an SF–LLL, "Disclosure of Lobbying Activities," as required under 15 CFR Part 28, Appendix B.

- (h) Lower tier certifications. Recipients shall require applicants/ bidders for subgrants, contacts, or other lower tier covered transactions at any tier under the award to submit, if applicable, a completed Form CD-512, "Certifications Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility and Voluntary **Exclusion-Lower Tier Covered** Transactions and Lobbying'' and disclosure form, SF–LLL, "Disclosure of Lobbying Activities." Form CD-512 is intended for the use of recipients and should not be transmitted to NIST. SF-LLL submitted by any tier recipient or subrecipient should be submitted to NIST in accordance with the instructions contained in the award document.
- (i) False statements. A false statement on an application is grounds for denial or termination of funds and grounds for possible punishment by a fine or imprisonment as provided in 18 U.S.C. 1001.
- (j) American-made equipment and products. Applicants are hereby notified that they are encouraged, to the greatest extent practicable, to purchase American-made equipment and products with the funding provided under this program in accordance with Congressional intent as set forth in the resolution contained in Public Law 103–317, Section 607 (a) and (b).
- (k) Intergovernmental review. Applicants under this program are subject to the requirements of Executive Order 12372, "Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs" to the extent permitted by law.
- (l) Classification. This notice relating to public property, loans, grants, benefits, or contracts is exempt from all requirements of section 553 of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 553(a)(2)) including notice and opportunity for comment. Therefore, a Regulatory Flexibility Analysis is not required and was not prepared for this notice for purpose of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 603 and 604). The program is not a major Federal action requiring an environmental assessment under the National Environmental Policy Act. This notice does not contain policies with Federalism implications sufficient to warrant preparation of a Federalism assessment under Executive Order 12612. This notice contains collection of information requirements subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act which have been approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB Control

Number 0693–0010, 0348–0043, and 0348–0044).

It has been determined that this rule is not significant for purposes of EO 12866.

Program Execution

- (a) Cooperative Agreement. The formal agreement between NIST and the applicant will be in the form of a Cooperative Agreement.
- (b) Project Work Plan. All recipients of awards are required to submit a Work Plan within thirty (30) days of the project start date. The work plan is a more detailed statement of work based on project objectives and activities the recipient will undertake to achieve the objectives and incorporates recommendations provided by the evaluation panel and the NIST Program Officer. The Work Plan must be reviewed and approved by NIST and will be incorporated into the cooperative agreement by amendment. Work Plan guidelines will be distributed to award recipients.
- (c) Project Reporting. Quarterly reports will be submitted to the NIST Program Manager no later than thirty (30) days after the end of each quarter of the award year. The information provided is used to characterize the projects, develop detailed case studies, and evaluate individual examples of outcomes. Quarterly reporting instructions will be distributed to award recipients.
- (d) Program Plan. A Program Plan will be submitted to the NIST Program Manager no later than thirty (30) days after the end of the award period. The Program Plan will discuss how the state will work with industry to develop a program that coordinates and supplements state resources for industrial modernization. The Plan must, at a minimum: characterize the industry in the state and survey their needs; identify and assess the relevance and sophistication of existing modernization resources; and develop a plan for a state-wide industrial modernization infrastructure that coordinates and complements existing relevant services and eliminates duplication. Program plans must be driven by industry needs. Program Plan guidelines will be distributed to award recipients.

Dated: May 1, 1995.

Samuel Kramer,

Associate Director.

[FR Doc. 95-11123 Filed 5-4-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-13-M

International Trade Administration

[A-570-834]

Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Disposable Pocket Lighters From the People's Republic of China

AGENCY: Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 5, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Julie Anne Osgood or Todd Hansen, Office of Countervailing Investigations, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482–0167 or (202) 482–1276, respectively.

Final Determination

We determine that disposable pocket lighters from the People's Republic of China ("PRC") are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value ("LTFV"), as provided in section 735 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"). The estimated margins are shown in the "Continuation of Suspension of Liquidation" section of this notice. The U.S. Department of Commerce ("the Department") also determines that critical circumstances exist for all exporters except Gao Yao (HK) Hua Fa Industrial Company Ltd. ("Gao Yao"), Guangdong Light Industrial Products Import & Export Corporation ("GLIP") and PolyCity Industrial Limited ("PolyCity").

Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute and to the Department's regulations are references to the provisions as they existed on December 31, 1994.

Case History

Since the preliminary determination on December 5, 1994, (Notice of Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Disposable Pocket Lighters from the People's Republic of China, 59 FR 64191 (December 13, 1994)), the following events have occurred:

On December 23, 1994, we issued our preliminary determination of critical circumstances with respect to the subject merchandise (60 FR 436, January 4, 1995).

On December 9 and December 19, 1994, Cli-Claque Company Limited ("Cli-Claque"), China National Overseas Trading Corporation ("COTCO"), Gao Yao and GLIP, requested a postponement of the final determination, pursuant to 19 CFR 353.20. Accordingly, on January 20, 1995, the deadline for the final determination was extended to April 27, 1995 (60 FR 5899, January 31, 1995).

From February 28 through March 17, 1995, we verified the responses of the exporters and producers of disposable

lighters.

Petitioner and respondents filed case briefs on April 6, 10, 11, and 12, and rebuttal briefs on April 13 and 14, 1995. A public hearing was held on April 17, 1995.

Scope of Investigation

The products covered by this investigation are disposable pocket lighters ("lighters"), whether or not refillable, whose fuel is butane, isobutane, propane, or other liquefied hydrocarbon, or a mixture containing any of these, whose vapor pressure at 75 degrees fahrenheit (24 degrees Celsius) exceeds a gauge pressure of 15 pounds per square inch. Non-refillable pocket lighters are imported under subheading 9613.10.0000 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States ("HTSUS"). Refillable, disposable pocket lighters would be imported under subheading 9613.20.0000. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and Customs purposes, our written description of the scope of this proceeding is dispositive.

Certain windproof refillable lighters, as described in memoranda to Barbara R. Stafford, dated December 5, 1994, and April 25, 1995, are excluded from the scope of this investigation. Also, excluded from the scope of this investigation are electric lighters (as described in the April 25, 1995 memo) which use two AA batteries to heat a coil for purposes of igniting smoking materials, rather than using butane, isobutane, propane, or other liquefied hydrocarbon to fuel a flame for purposes of igniting smoking materials.

Period of Investigation

The period of investigation ("POI") is December 1, 1993 through May 31, 1994.

Non-market Economy Status

The PRC has been treated as a non-market economy country ("NME") in past antidumping investigations (see, e.g., Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Saccharin from the People's Republic of China, 59 FR 58818 (November 15, 1994) ("Saccharin"). No information has been provided in this proceeding that would lead us to overturn our former determinations. Therefore, in accordance with section